



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,920	02/07/2005	Kazuhisa Mukai	MUKAI2	1923
1444	7590	04/11/2008	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303				BARNHART, LORA ELIZABETH
1651		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
04/11/2008		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation Sheet for Advisory Action

Continuation of Box 3. The proposed amendments will not be entered because they introduce new claim elements that have not heretofore been considered, specifically the sequence ID numbers at the end of claim 1. Had this limitation been included in the original claims, the examiner would have properly required an election of species since these sequences do not appear to share function and a common core structure. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims appear to incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 4 into claim 1, but claims 3 and 4 have not been cancelled, thus introducing issues of indefiniteness. For at least these reasons, the claims are not entered at this time.

Continuation of Box 11. The request for reconsideration has been fully considered, but it does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because it would not overcome all of the rejections of record even if the proposed amendments were entered.

Regarding the indefiniteness rejection, the examiner has not argued “substantially” is per se indefinite, but the claim does not particularly set forth what degree of increase would be considered “substantial.” As such, the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be determined, because it is not clear which conditions would be encompassed by the claim and which would not. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims introduce new issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as discussed above.

Regarding the art rejection, even if the enzyme of Yamamoto is distinct from those referenced in the proposed amendment to claim 1 (which the examiner does not concede), a prior art search for the claimed enzymes may necessitate a section 103 rejection, which has not been addressed herein. Further consideration is required.